## EXHIBIT 476

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

EASTERN DIVISION

- - -

IN RE: NATIONAL

PRESCRIPTION : MDL No. 2804

OPIATE LITIGATION :

\_\_\_ : Case No. : 1:17-MD-2804

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES

TO ALL CASES : Hon. Dan A. Polster

- - -

Monday, January 7, 2019

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO FURTHER CONFIDENTIALITY REVIEW

- - -

Videotaped deposition of TOM NAMETH, held at the offices of Cavitch, Familo & Durkin,
1300 East Ninth Street, Cleveland, Ohio, commencing at
9:03 a.m., on the above date, before Carol A. Kirk,
Registered Merit Reporter and Notary Public.

- - -

GOLKOW LITIGATION SERVICES 877.370.3377 ph | 917.591.5672 fax deps@golkow.com

	Page 358		Page 360
1	Q. Okay. So a more aggressive	1	Do you see that?
2	controlled substance monitoring system was never	2	A. Yes.
3	implemented?	3	Q. And there's a CDC Controlled
4	A. Correct.	4	Substances Model Policy attached, and this is
5	Q. Okay. Even though this e-mail	5	from Ed McGinley, right?
6	indicates that it was in the final process,	6	A. Right.
7	right?	7	Q. And he says, "Attached is a
8	A. I'm trying to find where that	8	substance model policy."
9	states.	9	And then down below, he says, "It
10	Q. Second sentence.	10	is a comprehensive document intended to be used
11	A. Oh, we're in the final process?	11	as a template to construct controlled substance
12	Unless he is in reference to the Chain Drug	12	policies or to evaluate and enhance existing
13	Consortium that was mentioned earlier in here	13	policies."
14	that we were looking to aggressively change our	14	Right?
15	controlled drug policy.	15	A. Correct.
16	Q. But this more aggressive	16	Q. And if you turn to the next page,
17	monitoring system was never put in place, as far	17	there's the document he's referring to.
18	as you know, right?	18	Do you see that?
19	A. Correct.	19	A. Yes.
20	Q. Okay. Is there a reason why you	20	Q. What, if anything, did you do with
21	guys were asking the DEA for guidance on your	21	this document?
22	monitoring system in 2013 and didn't do it	22	A. We reviewed it to see if it would
23	before that?	23	fit our model.
24	A. No. But even after attending this	24	Q. Did it fit?
	Page 359		Page 361
1	conference, they never really spelled out what	1	A. For the most part, yes, with small
2	methodology they really wanted us to do. It was	2	tweaks in there.
3	mentioned during this conference, "What are you	3	Q. Okay. Did you change your
4	doing about all the prescriptions that we're	4	unwritten controlled substance monitoring policy
5	seeing? You know, it's somebody's job to	5	at all after seeing this document?
6	monitor the doctors and all the scripts that	6	A. Not on a corporate level.
7	we're seeing."	7	Q. Okay. Did you do it on a store
8	That's that's the source of	8	level?
9	what we're filling their orders. Is anybody	9	A. No.
10	monitoring the doctors? Is the AMA? Is the	10	Q. Okay. So this didn't cause you to
11	DEA? And their answer was no.	11	change anything that you were doing, correct?
12	Q. All right. We're on 23 now, which	12	A. Correct.
13	is DDM31931.	13	Q. Okay. Did you ever provide a
14		14	document like this to a distributor if they
15	(DDM-Nameth Exhibit 23 marked.)	15	required evidence that you had a suspicious
16		16	order monitoring policy?
17	BY MR. MULLIGAN:	17	A. Yes. If they what we did, if I
18	Q. And just to confirm, you guys	18	remember correctly, in reviewing this this
19	never put your substance Controlled Substance	19	was in late '13 we looked at this and
20	Monitoring Policy in writing, correct?	20	basically what a lot of this is, or most of it,
21	A. Correct.	21	is what we currently were doing so that if
22	Q. All right. So this is an e-mail	22	someone did ask us for a written policy if we
23	from Ed McGinley and you're on the to line on	23	had a policy, this was already written in and it
24	December 2, 2013.	24	matched what we were currently doing, so we